



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/815,769

04/02/2004

Daisuke Yahata

360842009710

9944

7590
Barry E. Bretschneider
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Suite 300
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

02/13/2008

EXAMINER

JUSKA, CHERYL ANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,769

Applicant(s)

YAHATA ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention as set forth in section 5 of the last Office Action (Non-Final Rejection mailed 09/04/07).

Applicant traverses said rejection by asserting that the claim recitation of “an aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarn” sets forth both a description of the composition and the structure that produces these physical characteristics (Remarks, page 2, 1st paragraph). This argument is unpersuasive since said recitation of “an aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarn” does not provide sufficient clarity of the product that applicant has invented. *Ex parte Slob*, 157 USPQ 172, states, “Claims merely setting forth physical characteristics desired in an article, and not setting forth specific composition which would meet such characteristics, are invalid as vague, indefinite, and functional since they cover any conceivable combination of ingredients either presently existing or which might be discovered in the future and which would impart said desired characteristics.” Also, “it is necessary that the product be described with sufficient particularity that it can be identified so that one can determine what will and will not infringe.” *Benger Labs, Ltd v. R.K. Laros Co.*, 135 USPQ 11, *In re Bridgeford* 149 USPQ 55, *Locklin et al. v. Switzer Bros., Inc.*, 131 USPQ 294. Furthermore, “Reciting the physical and chemical characteristics of the claimed product will not suffice where it is not certain that a sufficient number of characteristics have been recited that the claim reads only on the particular

compound which applicant has invented.” *Ex parte Siddiqui*, 156 USPQ 426, *Ex parte Davission et al.*, 133 USPQ 400, *Ex parte Fox*, 128 USPQ 157.

Hence, it is reasserted that the claims have not been sufficiently described so that said claim only reads on the particular carpet yarn which applicant has invented and not other presently existing or future “aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarns.” For example, the Matsunaga references clearly teach “aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarns” as set forth in the prior art rejection of the last Office Action, section 8. It is not clear how the present claims differentiate from the cited prior art since said claims have not sufficiently described the present invention. Therefore, the 112, 2nd rejection is hereby maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 00/65140 issued to Matsunaga et al. as set forth in section 8 of the last Office Action.
4. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 2003/0152743 issued to Matsunaga et al. as set forth in section 8 of the last Office Action.

[Note US 2003/0152743 is the English language equivalent of the Japanese language WO 00/65140.]

Applicant has not amended the claims in an attempt to overcome the prior art rejections. Rather, applicant traverses on the grounds that a two-step drawing process is employed in the present invention, while the Matsunaga references disclose only a one-step drawing process which affects the crimp properties (Response, page 2, 4th paragraph – page 3, 1st paragraph). In response, this argument is not persuasive in that applicant has not shown any evidence or clear reasoning as to why the two-step drawing process inherently produces a patentably distinct process from the known prior art process. For example, applicant has not shown that the yarn of Matsunaga has a crimp elongation rate, boiling water shrinkage, and/or breaking strength outside of the range claimed by applicant.

Additionally, said argument is unpersuasive since applicant is not claiming a process of making a carpet or carpet yarn. Applicant is not even reciting product-by-process claims. Instead, applicant is claiming a final product. If the process of making the carpet yarn produces a patentably distinct product, then applicant's claims should reflect this. [Note a "product-by-process claim" amendment and/or a showing that the prior art process does not produce the claimed properties would likely overcome the standing prior art rejections and/or the standing 112 rejection.] Therefore, applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive.

To reiterate, the invention of claims 22-24 is taught by the Matsunaga references with the exception of the presently claimed properties of crimp elongation rate, boiling water shrinkage, and breaking strength. Although the references do not explicitly teach said property limitations, it is reasonable to presume that said limitations are inherent to the disclosed Matsunaga invention. Support for said presumption is found in the use of similar materials (i.e., crimped multifilament yarn of polylactic acid having a melting point greater than 130°C) and in the

similar production steps (i.e., tufting said crimped multifilament yarn into a base cloth) used to produce the tufted carpet. The burden is upon the applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 495. In the alternative, the claimed properties would obviously have been provided by the process disclosed by Matsunaga. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection under 35 USC 103 in addition to the rejection made above under 35 USC 102. Since applicant has not adequately met the burden of showing the prior art does not inherently possess the claimed properties, the above rejections stand.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
6. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is 571-272-1477. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10am-6pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached at 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cheryl Juska/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794